

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/960,244	HO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon Lankford	1651	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael G. Wityshyn (SPE). (3) N. Scott Pierce (Atty).
 (2) Mary K. Murray (Atty). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 January 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: USP 7015037.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed invention of instant claim 1 in view of USP 7015037. After review of instant application and '037, SPE's concern is that the cells of claim 1 appear to be the same as the cells of '037 and that the functions instantly claimed might be the same functions for both the instantly claimed cells and the cells of '037 when cultured under the same conditions. Mr. Pierce argued that the disclosure of '037 doesn't teach a cell population wherein greater than 91% of the cells of the cell population co-express CD49c and CD90 and wherein the cell population has a doubling rate of less than about 30 hours. Discussions were directed mainly to the doubling rate. SPE pointed out that the second paragraph on page 8 of the instant specification sets forth doubling times up to 144 hours and also states that "The doubling time of the cells of the invention can be varied depending on, for example, the density of the cells in culture (e.g., 100 cells/cm²) and/or the concentration of oxygen employed to culture the cells (e.g., a low oxygen concentration such as about 5% oxygen)", which supports the argument that the cells of claim 1 and the cells of '037 might function the same when cultured under the same conditions. When asked by the SPE if the cells cultured at 5% oxygen are different from the same cells cultured at 20% oxygen, Mr. Pierce said they were actually different and they have evidence to support that the cells are different and will consider filing evidence that the Office deems to be necessary. The Deans declaration filed in '037 sets forth data supporting the argument that the cells in '037 are the same as those instantly claimed when cultured under the same conditions. Also discussed the data shown in figure 3 of the Deans declaration in view of the doubling rate. The doubling rate from 7/30/04 to 8/3/04 was calculated using Applicants' formula to be 32, which is close to the instantly claimed doubling rate of "less than about 30 hours". The doubling rate from 8/3/04 to 8/6/04 was calculated to be 18, which is clearly less than about 30 hours. After 8/6/04, the doubling rate increases considerably above 30 hours. Mr. Pierce argued that the cells of the instantly claimed invention maintain a doubling rate of less than about 30 hours for a sustained period of several weeks. However, instant claim 1 doesn't set forth any time period for the doubling rate and therefore reads on the doubling rates shown by figure 3 of the Deans declaration and Applicants will consider amending the claim if necessary in response to the next Office action. Again, evidence would be helpful to show that the "sustained period" is not due to culturing under conditions which would also result in a similar sustained period for the cells of '037. In conclusion, an Office action will be issued in the next two weeks and Applicants will respond by amending the claims and/or providing evidence supporting their position that their cells are structurally different from the cells of '037.

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.